

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

Attorneys and Counselors
5445 Corporate Drive, Suite 400
Troy, Michigan 48098-2683
Phone: 248-641-1600
Fax: 248-641-0270
St. Louis, MO • Washington, D.C.

DATE: December 4, 2003

No. OF PAGES (INCLUDING THIS PAGE): 2

FOR: Examiner Alexander O. Williams

COMPANY: USPTO

FAX NO.: 703-308-7722

PHONE:

ORIGINAL WILL FOLLOW BY:

- ☐ REGULAR MAIL
☐ OVERNIGHT MAIL
☐ COURIER
☐ WILL NOT FOLLOW

FROM: Timothy D. MacIntyre

4041J-000478

Please let us know by phone or fax if you do not receive any of these pages.

COMMENTS:

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FAX RECEIVED

DEC 05 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

***** NOTICE *****

The information contained in this telefax transmission is intended only for the individual to whom or entity to which it is addressed. It may also contain privileged, confidential, attorney work product or trade secret information which is protected by law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the addressee, the reader is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us at the address above via the U.S. Postal Service. We will reimburse you for any reasonable expense (including postage) for the return of the original message.

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/785,464

First Named Applicant: Yoshihara

Examiner: A. Williams

Art Unit: 2826

Status of the Application: pending final Office Action

Issues to be Discussed:

- (1) Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,255,741 (Yoshihara). Since this patent qualifies as prior art under §102(e), applicant asserted that the present application and Yoshihara were under obligation to be assigned to same entity. Why was this not sufficient to overcome this rejection?
- (2) Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. 2000-31349, a Japanese equivalent of Yoshihara. Applicant does not believe that this reference constitutes prior art. Please advise under what section of §102 this document constitutes prior art.
- (3) Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,824,177 (Yoshihara) or an equivalent, Japanese Patent No. 9-27466. In citing this reference, the Examiner asserts Yoshihara discloses that the adhesive sheet 2 has a specific region having an adhesion characteristics less than the vicinal region surrounding the specific region. Applicant requests that the Examiner explicitly identify this teaching in the reference.
- (4) Please clarify concerns regarding Applicant's duty to disclose.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FAX RECEIVED
DEC 05 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800